UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/539,973	01/17/2006	Andreas Lotz	66107-003	2572

65358 7590 01/15/2009

WPAT, PC
7225 BEVERLY ST.
ANNANDALE, VA 22003

EXAMINER
BUTCHER, BRIAN M

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2627	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
01/15/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/539,973	LOTZ, ANDREAS	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	BRIAN BUTCHER	2627	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *10 October 2008*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-8* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-8* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *10 October 2008* is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☒ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☒ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Specification

The following guidelines illustrate the preferred layout for the specification of a utility application. These guidelines are suggested for the applicant's use.

Arrangement of the Specification

As provided in 37 CFR 1.77(b), the specification of a utility application should include the following sections in order. Each of the lettered items should appear in upper case, without underlining or bold type, as a section heading. If no text follows the section heading, the phrase "Not Applicable" should follow the section heading:

(a) TITLE OF THE INVENTION.
(b) CROSS-REFERENCE TO RELATED APPLICATIONS.
(c) STATEMENT REGARDING FEDERALLY SPONSORED RESEARCH OR DEVELOPMENT.
(d) THE NAMES OF THE PARTIES TO A JOINT RESEARCH AGREEMENT.
(e) INCORPORATION-BY-REFERENCE OF MATERIAL SUBMITTED ON A COMPACT DISC.
(f) BACKGROUND OF THE INVENTION.
    (1) Field of the Invention.
    (2) Description of Related Art including information disclosed under 37 CFR 1.97 and 1.98.
(g) BRIEF SUMMARY OF THE INVENTION.
(h) BRIEF DESCRIPTION OF THE SEVERAL VIEWS OF THE DRAWING(S).
(i) DETAILED DESCRIPTION OF THE INVENTION.
(j) CLAIM OR CLAIMS (commencing on a separate sheet).
(k) ABSTRACT OF THE DISCLOSURE (commencing on a separate sheet).
(l) SEQUENCE LISTING (See MPEP § 2424 and 37 CFR 1.821-1.825. A "Sequence Listing" is required on paper if the application discloses a nucleotide or amino acid sequence as defined in 37 CFR 1.821(a) and if the required "Sequence Listing" is not submitted as an electronic document on compact disc).

Drawings

The drawings are objected to because **every block in Figure 3 and Figure 4 must be descriptively labeled**. Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. The figure or figure number of an amended drawing should not be labeled as "amended." If a drawing figure is to be canceled, the appropriate figure must be removed from the replacement sheet, and where necessary, the remaining figures must be renumbered and appropriate changes made to the brief description of the several views of the drawings for consistency. Additional replacement sheets may be necessary to show the renumbering of the remaining figures. Each drawing sheet submitted after the filing date of an application must be labeled in the top margin as either "Replacement Sheet" or "New Sheet" pursuant to 37 CFR 1.121(d). If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which

said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1 and 3 - 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sawada et al. (European Patent Application Publication 0 679 983 A2) hereinafter referenced as Sawada, in view of Lin et al. (United States Patent US 4,807,118), hereinafter referenced as Lin.

Regarding **claim 1**, Sawada discloses an expansion device detachably installed into a computer system that reads on the module for reading data carriers claimed. First, Sawada discloses a substitute CDROM drive pack (50) (page 2, column 2, lines 9 - 29, and page 15, figure 2) which reads on "A module for reading data carriers, with a processor arrangement and a reading unit" claimed because the CDROM drive pack (50) includes a decoder circuit (9), buffer memory in the form of SRAM (15) or Flash memory (17), a digital signal processing circuit (3), and a digital to analog converter (7) needed to complete the processor arrangement. In addition, the CDROM drive pack (50) includes a spindle motor (5), motor drive circuit (12), pick up head (1), and slider motor (6) needed to complete the reading unit. Second, Sawada discloses that a CDROM drive pack (50) can be interchanged with a floppy disk drive (FDD) in a computer (page 2, column 2, and lines 9 - 29) which reads on “the module is designed for incorporation in a data processing device” claimed because a computer is a data processing device. Third, Sawada discloses that the RAM records various information from a disk including the Table of Contents (page 3, column1, line 58 and column 2, lines 1 – 10) which reads on “addressable coded data are stored on the data carrier” claimed because the Table of Contents contains recording

positions or addresses of coded data stored on the CDROM. Fourth, Sawada discloses a decoder circuit (9) (page 5, column 8, lines 19 - 21, and figure 2) which reads on “the processor arrangement comprises a decoding function” claimed. Fifth, Sawada discloses a CPU (10) that controls the operation of the CDROM drive (50) (page 5, column 8, lines 32 - 36, and figure 2) which reads on "controlling the reading unit such that the requested data, defined by a start address, are read in the coded form from the data carrier" claimed. Sixth, Sawada discloses that the decoder circuit (9) decodes a signal to send it to the system bus (page 5, column 8, lines 19 - 21, and figure 2) which reads on “converting the coded data into decoded data by means of the decoding function" claimed. In addition, Sawada discloses an interface circuit (9) that includes a control register, command register, status register, error register, and data register used to control the flow of data between the host and the drive (50) (page 6 column 9, lines 7 - 22, and figure 2), however, Sawada fails disclose “receiving a request, characterized by an identifier, for decoded data which are stored in coded form on the data carrier” and "sending the decoded data, characterized by the identifier, to the data processing device, wherein the identifier is used to distinguish between data belonging to the previous request and data belonging to the current request”. The examiner maintains that it was well known in the art for the CD ROM drive pack disclosed in Sawada to include the characterization of both data requests and data transmissions via an identifier, as taught by Lin.

In a related field of endeavor, Lin discloses a method for handling slot requests over a network in which an application specific header comprises a request ID (250) which is used to identify a request (column 8, lines 59 - 61 'The application specific header 402 comprises . . .a request ID 250', lines 67—68 through column 9, line 1 'The request ID field is a monotonically increasing number which is used to identify a request') and that both a requesting and serving computer system may use this field to determine if a received message is new or repeat (column 9, lines 1 – 3 'The requesting and serving computer systems may use this field to determine if a received message is new or a repeat') which reads on both receiving a request characterized by an identifier and sending data characterized by an identifier.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the CDROM drive pack of Sawada by specifically using the teachings in Lin to include "receiving a request, characterized by an identifier, for decoded data which are stored in coded form on the data carrier" and "sending the decoded data, characterized by the identifier, to the data processing device, wherein the identifier is used to distinguish between data belonging to the previous request and data belonging to the current request" because one having ordinary skill in the art would want to determine if a message (request) received by the processor arrangement is new or a repeat and whether a message (data) received by the data processing device is new or a repeat (Lin, column 9, lines 1 - 3 'The requesting and serving

computer systems may use this field to determine if a received message is new or a repeat).

Regarding **claim 3**, SL disclose everything claimed as applied above (see claim 1), in addition, Sawada discloses that the Table of Contents information from the disk is recorded in the RAM (15) and is used for illegal request error processing or searching recording request positions for which disk access request occurs (page 8, column 13, lines 11 – 20) which reads on “the processor arrangement is designed for receiving the start address immediately along with the request” because the Table of Contents includes information concerning the start addresses of coded data on a data carrier.

Regarding **claim 4**, SL disclose everything claimed as applied above (see claim 1), in addition, Sawada discloses a RAM (15) as a dating saving means (page 5, column 8, lines 46 – 56) which reads on “the module comprises a memory arrangement” because the RAM (15) is contained within the CDROM drive (50) and reads on "said memory arrangement is designed for storing table of contents information of the data carrier" because the RAM (15) is used to store various information including allocation information such as the Table of Contents. Furthermore, Sawada discloses that the Table of Contents information from the disk is recorded in the RAM (15) and is used for illegal request error processing or searching recording request positions for which disk access request occurs (page 8, column 13, lines 11 – 20) which reads on “the processor unit is designed for deriving the start address from the request by using the table

of contents" because the RAM (15), containing start addresses, is integrally used by the CPU (10).

Regarding **claim 5**, SL disclose everything claimed as applied above (see claim 1), in addition, Sawada discloses the CDROM drive is connected to the main CPU through system bus 80 so that it can send to or receive commands from the host (column 7, lines 10 – 13) which reads on "the processor arrangement is designed for receiving the request characterized by an identifier via a first serial bus and for sending the decoded data characterized by the identifier to the data processing device via a second serial bus" in conjunction with the disclosure of Lin (see argument concerning claim 1 in regard to both receiving a request characterized by an identifier and sending data characterized by an identifier and that the data bus 80 disclosed by Sawada is well know to be a parallel bus which is comprised on many individual serial busses.

Regarding **claim 6**, SL disclose everything claimed as applied above (see claim 1), in addition, Sawada discloses a CPU (10) for controlling the operation of each unit within the CDROM drive (50) including the decoder circuit (9) (page 5, column 8, lines 32 – 33, and figure 2) and that a ROM 16 stores various types of firmware (page 5, column 8, lines 37 – 45, and figure 2) which reads on "the module comprises a memory arrangement, and in that the processor arrangement is designed for loading a decoding program from the memory arrangement, which program carries out the decoding function on a programmable processor" because the CPU (10) operates from firmware stored

in the ROM (16) to control the decoder circuit (9). However, Sawada fails to explicitly disclose that the firmware includes a program for decoding. The examiner maintains that it is obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art that the firmware contained in the ROM (16) (page 5, column 8, lines 37 – 45, and figure 2) taught by Sawada contains a program for decoding because the firmware is responsible for controlling the CPU (10) which controls the decoder circuit (9). Therefore, the CPU (10) as taught by Sawada includes a decoder program for control of the decoder circuit (9) for decoding.

Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sawada, in view of LIn, and further in view of Otsubo (United States Patent US 5,202,866) hereinafter referenced as Otsubo.

Regarding **claim 2**, Sawada and Lin, the combination of hereinafter referenced as SL, disclose everything claimed as applied above (see claim 1), however, SL fail to disclose that "the processor arrangement is designed for characterizing the decoded data by means of the current address from which the coded data were read from the data carrier".

In a similar field of endeavor, Otsubo discloses a digital audio disc player in which a controller (7) receives a current address CADD from a decoded output during a reading operation (column 4, lines 11 – 15 'the processor read a current track number CTN to which the spot had jumped and a current address CADD (absolute time on the disk) from the decoded output of the subcode decoder 8') which reads on characterizing the decoded data via the current address.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the CDROM drive pack of Sawada by specifically using the teachings in Otsubo to include "the processor arrangement [being] designed for characterizing the decoded data by means of the current address from which the coded data were read from the data carrier" because one having ordinary skill in the art would want to correlate the decoded data with its physical location on a data carrier.

Claims 7 and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sawada, in view of Lin, and further in view of Gorzelski et al. (Untied States Patent 6,134,192) hereinafter referenced as Gorzelski.

Regarding **claim 7**, SL disclose everything claimed as applied above (see claim 1), however, Sawada fails to disclose that "the data processing device is a car radio or a navigation system or combined car radio/navigation system". The examiner maintains that it was well known in the art for the CDROM drive pack disclosed in Sawada to be included in a "data processing device [being] a car radio or a navigation system or combined car radio/navigation system", as taught by Gorzelski.

In a similar field of endeavor Gorzelski discloses a combined multiple CD player and radio receiver system (10) (column 2, lines 12 – 16, and figure 1, items 10, 12, 14) which reads on "the data processing device is a car radio or a navigation system or combined car radio/navigation system" because a CD

player module (12) is integrated with a radio receiver (14) in a system (10) for use in an automobile.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the CDROM drive pack of Sawada by specifically using the teachings in Gorzelski to be included in a "data processing device [being] a car radio or a navigation system or combined car radio/navigation system " because one having ordinary skill in the art would recognize the ability to use the module in a mobile automotive environment from Sawada's teachings of a mobile computing environment (see Sawada, page 1, column 2, lines 25 – 29).

Regarding **claim 8**, Sawada, Lin, and Gorzelski disclose everything claimed as applied above (see claim 7), in addition Sawada discloses a portable computer (100) that incorporates a CDROM drive pack (50) (page 2, column 2, lines 25 - 29, and figure 119) which reads on "A data carrier playback device, in which a module according to one of the claim 1-7 is incorporated" because the portable computer is a data carrier playback device.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed on 10/10/2008 with respect to claims 1 and 2 have been fully considered and are persuasive. In response, the original rejections are withdrawn and new rejections have been entered. However, applicant's argument with respect to claim 5 is not persuasive.

Regarding **claim 5**, there is a recitation of both "a first serial bus" and "a second serial bus", however the applicant fails to claim that these data busses are separate and different. In other words, it is not made clear that these serial busses are not part of a larger parallel bus. Therefore, the examiner maintains that the prior art teaching of an inherent parallel bus for data transfer in Sawada reads on the two serial busses claimed.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to BRIAN BUTCHER whose telephone number is (571)270-5575. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday – Friday from 6:30 AM to 3:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Wayne Young, can be reached at (571) 272 - 7582. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

BMB
January 12, 2009

/Wayne Young/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2627